

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/936,344	BUWALDA ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	N. Bhat	1764

All Participants:

Status of Application: Pending Allowance

(1) N. Bhat. (3) _____

(2) Ms. Sipos. (4) _____

Date of Interview: 20 December 2004

Time: _____

Type of Interview:

- Telephonic
 Video Conference
 Personal (Copy given to: Applicant Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: Yes No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

102/103

Claims discussed:

1,3-5,7-9 and 11-17

Prior art documents discussed:

Devries and Lenaerts et al.

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner discussed with applicant's representative, that the addition of the cross-linking agent and amount although limiting the claim, does not impart patentability in light of applicant's own disclosure that the cross-linking agents and amounts are known in the art and that the starch is cross-linked with 0.01% to 0.25%....under conditions known to the artisan. See Page 12 of the specification. This information taken with Lenaerts et al. who teaches crosslinked high amylose starch or a composition comprising a non-cereal starch which is cross linked with adipic anhydride, sodium trimetaphosphate or phosphorous oxychloride has been taught. Applicant's representative did point out to the examiner that Lenaerts et al. does not qualify as prior art. The examiner conceded this point but maintained that applicant's own disclosure teaches that cross-linking with these cross-linking agents in the amounts disclosed is known to the artisan. In order to expedite prosecution, the examiner requested applicant to include the amylopectin:amylose ratio set forth in claim 4 into all of the independent claims which was agreed to by applicant which places the application in condition for allowance. Applicant's representative did send a draft amendment making the changes to the applicant who made the changes by examiner's amendment.